

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

RICKY M. ARNTSEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:24-CV-5511-BHS-DWC

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME

The District Court has referred this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action to United States Magistrate Judge David W. Christel. Plaintiff Ricky M. Arnsten is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this matter. Currently pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for extension of time to respond to summary judgment (Dkt. 127).¹

On February 14, 2025, Defendants State of Washington Department of Corrections, Steven Sinclair, Cheryl Strange, Jeri Boe, Danielle Armbruster, Paul Clark, J. Scott Edwards, Linda Ineman, Rhonda Stump, Shane Evans, Jay Jackson, Ron Haynes, Jason Bennett, Annikaa

¹ The Court acknowledges the motion is noted for July 23, 2025, and the non-moving parties have not had an opportunity to respond. *See* Dkt. 127. However, because the motion seeks only a 14-day extension of time and would be moot by the noting date, the Court finds it is appropriate to resolve the motion expeditiously.

1 Mizin, Jeff Tatro, and Patrick Collecchi (“the State Defendants”)² moved for summary judgment
2 and noted the motion for consideration on March 14, 2025. Dkt. 90. Plaintiff sought and received
3 two extensions of time to respond to the State Defendants’ motion, and the Court further
4 extended the response date to allow time for mailing of documents. *See* Dkts. 101, 105, 107, 113,
5 126. In the Court’s most recent order, Plaintiff was directed to file his response on or before July
6 3, 2025. Dkt. 126. Plaintiff filed this motion for extension of time on July 2, 2025, seeking an
7 additional 14 days to respond to the motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 127.

8 When a request for an extension of time is made before a deadline, the Court may grant
9 the extension for good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A). As with all civil procedural rules, the
10 Court must liberally construe Rule 6(b)(1) “to effectuate the general purpose of seeing that cases
11 are tried on the merits.” *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1258–59 (9th Cir.
12 2010) (quoting *Rodgers v. Watt*, 722 F.2d 456, 459 (9th Cir. 1983)). “‘Good cause’ is a non-
13 rigorous standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts.” *Id.*
14 at 1259. Accordingly, “requests for extensions of time made before the applicable deadline has
15 passed should normally be granted in the absence of bad faith on the part of the party seeking
16 relief or prejudice to the adverse party.” *Id.* (cleaned up).

17 In the interests of justice and in light of Plaintiff’s *pro se* prisoner status, the Court finds
18 Plaintiff has shown good cause for a short extension of time. However, because Plaintiff has
19 already received multiple extensions to respond to the motion for summary judgment, he is
20 advised that no further extensions will be granted absent extraordinary circumstances.

23 ² Defendant Byd Surgical Masks Manufacturer has not yet appeared in the case. *See* Dkts. 58, 82. Defendant
24 Honeywell Safety Products USA, Inc. has filed an answer and is subject to a separate pretrial scheduling order. *See*
Dkts. 108, 118.

1 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS as follows:

2 (1) Plaintiff's motion for extension of time (Dkt. 127) is GRANTED.

3 (2) The new deadline for Plaintiff to file a response the State Defendants' motion
4 for summary judgment is **July 17, 2025**. The State Defendants may file a
5 reply in support of their motion not later than **July 24, 2025**.

6 (3) The Clerk of Court is directed to re-note the State Defendants' motion for
7 summary judgment (Dkt. 90) for consideration on **July 24, 2025**.

8 Dated this 7th day of July, 2025.

9
10 

11 David W. Christel
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24